

ESP012.I

09/329,182

Amendment D

REMARKS**A. Claim Amendments**

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 19-48 are presented for examination. Claims 2, 6, 9-12, and 15-18 were previously canceled in a prior Office Action Response. Claims 1, 5, 19, 34 and 47 are amended.

Claims 1, 5, 19, and 34 are amended to clarify that the destination device is external and separate from the input device. Applicants thank the Examiner for clarification of the misunderstanding that the Examiner assumed that the client device was intended to be part of the input device. Applicants had intended the client device and input device to be distinct from each other, as recited in the specification.

Claim 47 is amended to maintain a consistency with other claims.

B. Office Action Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 13, 14, and 19-48 were rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being as being anticipated by Unno (U.S. Pat. 6,437,875).

The Office Action states that Applicants' arguments filed on May 20, 2003 are not persuasive at least because, "Applicants have broadly claimed the destination device send input information to said input device. Applicants do not clearly claim the destination device as a external device separate from input device as argued in independent claim 1 [paper no. 23]; therefore, Examiner asserts that Unno does teach this part of the claim as shown in the recited reference". The Office action then goes on to repeat many of the rejections of previous paper 20.

The arguments filed May 20, 2003 pointed out that the Unno architecture relied upon for rejection of the present claims described the internal functions/components of a copy/fax machine, and the management of data files internal to the copy/fax machine. Applicants pointed out that the presently claimed invention is directed to a network having a separate input device, a

ESP012.I

09/329,182

Amendment D

separate client (or destination) device, and a separate storage device, and for the data transmission management of generated data files.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 to clearly recite that the destination device is separate and external from the input device. Applicants thus believe that claims 1 and 5 now clearly overcome the Unno reference.

Additionally, Applicants respectfully point out that claim 13 already clearly recited "a destination device remote from said input device" and a network having separate "image input device" and "client device". Therefore, it was inappropriate to reject claim 13, and its dependent claims, based on the internal architecture and internal file management recited in the Unno reference.

In regard to the other claims, the Office Action makes several rejection based on Unno's: Fig. 12; col. 7, line 60 to col. 8, line 3; col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 63; col. 13, line 17 to col. 15, line 5; col. 27, lines 1-16; col. 18, line 35 to col. 19, line 67; and col. 27, lines 2-35, all of which describe either the internal architecture, internal file management, or internal operating system of Unno's copy/fax machine. The presently claimed destination device is not a component or file management step internal to the presently claimed input device.

Also, Applicants respectfully point out that Unno's Fig. 1 shows a general network arrangement, and describes the various methods of well-known network communication. In Unno's description of a general network (Fig. 1), Unno does not recite the specific file transfer methods/mechanisms claimed in the present invention.

For example, Unno's general description of his general network shown in his Fig. 1 does not state (as is claimed in the present invention) that the destination device identifies a destination address for a remote storage device accessible over the network, and that the input device sends input data to the specified remote storage device and then sends a notification the destination device that the input data is available for pickup, after which the destination devices initiates the retrieval of the input data from the remote storage device. Applicants do not doubt that the basic network shown in Unno's Fig. 1 may be

ESP012.I

09/329,182

Amendment D

used to implement such a task since the present invention is intended for existing networks, but Applicants point out that Applicants are not claiming a new type of network. Rather, Applicants are claiming a method/system for transferring generated input data from an input device to a destination device following a specific file transfer sequence.

Also, Applicants respectfully point out that one should not read more into a reference than is reasonably recited therein. For example, the Office Action appears to equate the use of email, to the presently claimed sequence of having the input device transfer input data to a specified storage location indicated by the destination device, sending a notification to the destination device, and having the destination device respond by retrieving the input data for the storage location. Applicants respectfully point out that when an email is sent, the email file is sent to an email server and the sender (i.e. Unno's input device) has no control of when the generated input data is delivered to its storage device (or indeed able to specify a specific storage device/location). Furthermore, the email server itself does the storing, notifying, and delivery of the email file. This distinction is important, since Unno's method requires the use of mail server on the network in order to accomplish his task, and further surrenders key file transfer sequences from his input device to the mail server. By contrast, the input device of the present invention stores its generated input data in a specific remote storage location, and sends the address of this specific remote storage location to the destination device once the input data is known to have been transferred a specific storage device.

Additionally in reference to claims 27-29 (and equivalently to claim 42-44), the Office action asserts that Unno's Fig. 12, col. 10 lines 40-64 show that "said notification includes parameter data descriptive of said image data, and said client device initiates the retrieval of said image data only if it determines that its physical parameters are capable of manipulating said image data". Applicants respectfully make two points in traversing this assertion. Firstly, the cited reference refers to the internal function of Unno's fax/copier, and do not refer to the operation of the destination device, as is required by the presently claimed invention. Secondly, the cited reference explains that Unno's fax/copier

ESP012.I

09/329,182

Amendment D

is capable of adjusting the resolution of a scanned image, and is further able to select an appropriate network communication protocol for communicating with a specific server type. This reference is silent on any operation specifying that the destination device makes a decision to either retrieve or not retrieve input data base on whether it can support the specific image data file. This claimed limitation reduces wasted time due to failed downloads and operation crashes.

In other words, claims 27-29 and 42-44 require that the client device be self-aware of the type of image data it can support, and that it retrieve image data from the remote storage device only if the client device supports the type of image data stored in the remote storage device. This type of conditional retrieval is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Rosalio Haro
Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95134
Phone: (408) 952-6000
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: November 26, 2003